arXiv:1409.3865v1 [cs.CC] 12 Sep 2014

On Stability Property of Probability Laws with Respect to Small Violations of Algorithmic Randomness

Vladimir V. V'yugin*
Institute for Information Transmission Problems
and
National Research University Higher School of Economics
Bol'shoi Karetnyi per. 19, Moscow GSP–4, 127994, Russia
e-mail vyugin@iitp.ru

Abstract

We study a stability property of probability laws with respect to small violations of algorithmic randomness. A sufficient condition of stability is presented in terms of Schnorr tests of algorithmic randomness. Most probability laws, like the strong law of large numbers, the law of iterated logarithm, and even Birkhoff's pointwise ergodic theorem for ergodic transformations, are stable in this sense.

Nevertheless, the phenomenon of instability occurs in ergodic theory. Firstly, the stability property of the Birkhoff's ergodic theorem is non-uniform. Moreover, a computable non-ergodic measure preserving transformation can be constructed such that ergodic theorem is non-stable. We also show that any universal data compression scheme is also non-stable with respect to the class of all computable ergodic measures.

*This paper is an extended version of the talk at the Eighth International Conference on Computability, Complexity and Randomness (CCR 2013). September 23-27, 2013, Moscow, Russia; see also the conference paper V'yugin [24]. This work is partially supported by grant RFBR 13-01-12458

1 Introduction

In this paper we study stability property of probability laws with respect to small violations of randomness. By a probability law we mean a property $\Phi(\omega)$ of infinite binary sequences ω which holds almost surely. We define a notion of stability of a probability law in terms of algorithmic theory of randomness. Within the framework of this theory the probability laws are formulated in "a pointwise" form. It is well known that main laws of probability theory are valid not only almost surely but for each individual Martin-Löf random sequence.

Some standard notions of algorithmic randomness are given in Section 2. We use the definition of a random sequence in the complexity terms. An infinite binary sequence $\omega_1\omega_2\ldots$ is Martin-Löf random with respect to uniform (or 1/2-Bernoulli) measure if and only if $Km(\omega^n) \geq n - O(1)$ as $n \to \infty$, where $Km(\omega^n)$ is the monotonic Kolmogorov complexity of a binary string $\omega^n = \omega_1 \ldots \omega_n$ and the constant $O(1)$ depends on ω but not on n. [1]

A probability law $\Phi(\omega)$ is called stable if an unbounded computable function $\sigma(n)$ exists such that $\Phi(\omega)$ is true for each infinite sequence ω such that $Km(\omega^n) \geq n - \sigma(n) - O(1)$ as $n \to \infty$. We assume that this function non-decreasing and refer to the function $\sigma(n)$ as to a degree if stability.

A stability property under small violations of algorithmic randomness of the main limit probability laws was discovered by Schnorr [14] and Vovk [18]. They shown that the law of large numbers for the uniform Bernoulli measure holds for a binary sequence $\omega_1\omega_2\ldots$ if $Km(\omega^n) \geq n-\sigma(n)-O(1)$, where $\sigma(n)$ is an arbitrary computable function such that $\sigma(n) = o(n)$ as $n \to \infty$, and the law of iterated logarithm holds if $Km(\omega^n) \geq n-\sigma(n)-O(1)$, where $\sigma(n)$ is an arbitrary computable function such that $\sigma(n) = o(\log\log n)$. [2] V'yugin [20] shown that the law of the length of longest head-run in an individual random sequence is stable with degree of stability $\sigma(n) = o(\log\log n)$. It was shown in these papers that corresponding degrees of stability are tight.

We present in Proposition 4 a sufficient condition of stability in terms of Schnorr tests of randomness. We mention that if a computable rate of convergence almost surely exists then the corresponding probability law holds for any Schnorr random sequence. In turn, the latter property implies stabil-

[1] The same property holds also if we replace monotonic complexity $Km(\omega^n)$ on the prefix complexity $KP(\omega^n)$. The difference is that an inequality $Km(\omega^n) \leq n+O(1)$ holds for monotonic complexity but this is not true for prefix complexity.

[2] In what follows all logarithms are on the base 2.

ity property of this law. Using this sufficient condition, we prove that most probability laws, like the strong law of large numbers and the law of iterated logarithm, are stable under small violations of algorithmic randomness. Theorem 1 shows that the Birkhof's ergodic theorem is also stable in case where measure preserving transformation is ergodic.

In Section 4 we show that the phenomenon of instability occurs in ergodic theory. First, there are no universal stability bounds in ergodic theorems or ergodic transformations. The Birkhof's ergodic theorem is non-stable for some non-ergodic stationary measure preserving transformation.

We note that there is some analogy with the lack of universal convergence rate estimates in ergodic theory. A lack of universal convergence bounds is typical for asymptotic results of ergodic theory like Birkhoff's ergodic theorem – Krengel [10], Shannon–McMillan–Breiman theorem and universal compressing schemes – Ryabko [13].

2 Preliminaries

Let $\Theta = \{0,1\}^*$ be a set of all finite binary sequences (binary strings) and $\Omega = \{0,1\}^\infty$ be a set of all infinite binary sequences. Let $l(\alpha)$ denotes the length of a sequence α ($l(\alpha) = \infty$ for $\alpha \in \Omega$).

For any finite or infinite sequence $\omega = \omega_1\omega_2\ldots$, we write $\omega^n = \omega_1\omega_2\ldots\omega_n$, where $n \leq l(\omega)$. Also, we write $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ if $\alpha = \beta^n$ for some n. Two finite sequences α and β are incomparable if $\alpha \not\subseteq \beta$ and $\beta \not\subseteq \alpha$. A set $A \subseteq \Theta$ is prefix-free if any two distinct sequences from A are incomparable.

A complexity of a string $x \in \Theta^*$ is equal to the length of the shortest binary codeword p (i.e. $p \in \{0,1\}^*$) by which the string x can be reconstructed: $K_\psi(x) = \min\{l(p) : \psi(p) = x\}$. We suppose that $\min\emptyset = +\infty$.

By this definition the complexity of x depends on a computable (partial recursive) function ψ – method of decoding. Kolmogorov proved that an optimal decoding algorithm ψ exists such that $K_\psi(x) \leq K_{\psi'}(x) + O(1)$ holds for any computable decoding function ψ' and for all strings x. We fix some optimal decoding function ψ. The value $K(x) = K_\psi(x)$ is called Kolmogorov complexity of x.

If domains of decoding algorithms are prefix-free sets the same construction gives us the definition of prefix complexity $KP(x)$.

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a set of all real numbers, $\mathcal{Q}$ be a set of all rational numbers.

A function $f : \Theta \to \mathcal{R}$ is called computable if there exists an algorithm

which given $x \in \Theta$ and a rational $\epsilon > 0$ computes a rational approximation of a number $f(x)$ with accuracy ϵ.

For a general reference on algorithmic randomness, see Li and Vitányi [11]. We confine our attention to the Cantor space Ω with the uniform Bernoulli measure $B_{1/2}$. Hoyrup and Rojas [7] proved that any computable probability space is isomorphic to the Cantor space in both the computable and measure-theoretic senses. Therefore, there is no loss of generality in restricting to this case.

The topology on the set Ω is generated by the binary intervals $\Gamma_x = \{\omega \in \Omega : x \subset \omega\}$, where x is a finite binary sequence. An important example of computable measure is the uniform Bernoulli measure $B_{1/2}$, where $B_{1/2}(\Gamma_x) = 2^{-l(x)}$ for any finite binary sequence x.

An open subset U of Ω is called effectively open if it can be represented as a union of a computable sequence of binary intervals: $U = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \Gamma_{\alpha_i}$, where $\alpha_i = f(i)$ is a computable function from i. A sequence U_n, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, of effectively open sets is called effectively enumerable if each open set U_n can be represented as $U_n = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \Gamma_{\alpha_{n,i}}$, where $\alpha_{n,i} = f(n, i)$ is a computable function from n and i.

Martin-Löf test of randomness with respect to a computable measure P is an effectively enumerable sequence U_n, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, of effectively open sets such that $P(U_n) \leq 2^{-n}$ for all n. If the real numbers $P(U_n)$ are uniformly computable then the test U_n, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, is called Schnorr test of randomness. [3]

An infinite binary sequence ω passes a test U_n, , $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, if $\omega \notin \cap U_n$. A sequence ω is Martin-Löf random with respect to the measure P if it passes each Martin-Löf test of randomness. A notion of Schnorr random sequence is defined analogously.

In what follows we mainly consider the notion of randomness with respect to the uniform Bernoulli measure $B_{1/2}$.

An equivalent definition of randomness can be obtained using Solovay tests of randomness. A computable sequence $\{x_n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ of binary strings is called Solovay test of randomness with respect to the uniform measure if the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-l(x_n)}$ converges.

An infinite sequence ω passes a Solovay test of randomness $\{x_n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ if $x_n \not\subseteq \omega$ for almost all n.

[3] Uniform computability of $P(U_n)$ means that there is an algorithm which given n and $\epsilon > 0$ outputs a rational approximation of $P(U_n)$ up to ϵ.

We use an equivalence between Martin-Löf and Solovay tests of randomness.

Proposition 1 *An infinite sequence $\omega = \omega_1\omega_2\ldots$ is Martin-Löf random if and only if it passes each Solovay test of randomness.*

Proof. Assume that ω is not Martin-Löf random. Then a Martin-Löf test U_n, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, exists such that $\omega \in \cap U_n$. Define a Solovay test of randomness as follows. Since U_n is effectively open and $B_{1/2}(U_n) \leq 2^{-n}$ for all n, we can effectively compute a prefix-free sequence of strings x_n, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, such that $\cup_n \Gamma_{x_n} = \cup_n U_n$ and the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-l(x_n)}$ converges. Evidently $x_n \subset \omega$ for infinitely many n.

On the other side, assume that for some Solovay test x_n, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, $x_n \subset \omega$ for infinitely many n. Let $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-l(x_n)} < 2^K$, where m is a positive integer number. Let U_n be a set of all infinite ω such that $|\{m : x_m \subset \omega\}| \geq 2^{n+K}$. It is easy to verify that U_n is a Martin-Löf test of randomness and that $\omega \in \cap U_n$. $\triangle$

We also consider total Solovay tests of randomness which leads to the same definition of randomness as Schnorr tests of randomness (see Downey and Griffiths [2]). A series $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r_i$ converges with a computable rate of convergence if a computable function $m(\delta)$ exists such that $|\sum_{i=m(\delta)}^{\infty} r_i| \leq \delta$ for each positive rational number δ. A Solovay test of randomness $\mathcal{T} = \{x_n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ is called total if the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-l(x_n)}$ converges with a computable rate of convergence.

Proposition 2 *An infinite sequence $\omega = \omega_1\omega_2\ldots$ is Schnorr random if and only if it passes each total Solovay test of randomness.*

The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 1.

The equivalent definitions of Martin-Löf random sequence is obtained in terms of algorithmic complexity (see Li and Vitanyi [11]).

In terms of prefix complexity the following definition is known. An infinite sequence ω is Martin-Löf random with respect to a computable measure P if and only if $KP(\omega^n) \geq -\log P(\omega^n) + O(1)$

Analogous definition can be obtained in terms of monotonic complexity. Let us define a notion of a monotonic computable transformation of binary

sequences. A computable representation of such operation is a set $\hat{\psi} \subseteq \{0,1\}^* \times \{0,1\}^*$ such that (i) the set $\hat{\psi}$ is recursively enumerable; (ii) for any $(x,y),(x',y') \in \hat{\psi}$ if $x \subseteq x'$ then $y \subseteq y'$ or $y' \subseteq y$; (iii) if $(x,y) \in \hat{\psi}$ then $(x,y') \in \hat{\psi}$ for all $y' \subseteq y$.

The set $\hat{\psi}$ defines a monotonic with respect to $\subseteq$ decoding function [4] $\psi(p) = \sup\{x : \exists p'(p' \subseteq p \& (p',x) \in \hat{\psi})\}$.

Any computable monotonic function ψ determines the corresponding measure of complexity $Km_\psi(x) = \min\{l(p) : x \subseteq \psi(p)\} = \min\{l(p) : (x,p) \in \hat{\psi}\}$. The invariance property also holds for monotonic measures of complexity: an optimal computable operation ψ exists such that $Km_\psi(x) \leq Km_{\psi'}(x) + O(1)$ for all computable operations ψ' and for all finite binary sequences x.

An infinite sequence ω is Martin-Löf random with respect to a computable measure P if and only if $Km(\omega^n) = -\log P(\omega^n) + O(1)$. In particular, an infinite binary sequence ω is Martin-Löf random (with respect to uniform measure) if and only if $Km(\omega^n) = n + O(1)$ (see for details Li and Vitanyi [11]).

The function $dm_P(\omega^n) = -\log P(\omega^n) - Km(\omega^n)$ is called universal deficiency of randomness (with respect to a measure P). For the uniform measure, $dm(\omega^n) = n - Km(\omega^n)$.

3 Algorithmically stable laws

Let $\Phi(\omega)$ be an asymptotic probability law, i.e., a property of infinite binary sequences which holds almost surely.

Kolmogorov's algorithmic approach to probability theory offers a new paradigm for logic of probability. We can formulate an equivalent form of a probabilistic law: $Km(\omega^n) \geq n - O(1) \Longrightarrow \Phi(\omega)$.

In this paper we present a more deep analysis. We call a law $\Phi(\omega)$ stable if there exists a unbounded nondecreasing computable function $\alpha(n)$ such that $Km(\omega^n) \geq n - \alpha(n) - O(1) \Longrightarrow \Phi(\omega)$. The function $\alpha(n)$ is called degree of stability of the law $\Phi(\omega)$.

[4] Here the by supremum we mean an union of all comparable x in one sequence.

3.1 A sufficient condition of stability

We present in this section a sufficient condition of stability of a probability law and present examples of probability laws which are stable with different degree of stability. We formulate this sufficient condition in terms of Schnorr [14] definition of algorithmic random sequence. The choice of Schnorr's definition is justified by an observation that a vast majority of such laws holds for Schnorr random sequences.

An algorithmic effective version of convergence almost surely of functions f_n of type $\Omega \to \mathcal{R}^+$ was introduced in V'yugin [19]. A sequence of functions f_n effectively converges to a function f almost surely if a computable function $m(\delta, \epsilon)$ exists such that

$$B_{1/2}\{\omega : \sup_{n \geq m(\delta,\epsilon)} |f_n(\omega) - f(\omega)| > \delta\} < \epsilon \tag{1}$$

for all positive rational numbers δ and ϵ.

The following simple proposition was formulated in [19] for Martin-Löf notion of randomness. It holds also for Schnorr random sequences.

Proposition 3 *Let a computable sequence of functions f_n effectively converges almost surely to some function f. Then a Schnorr test of randomness $\mathcal{T}$ can be constructed such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(\omega) = f(\omega)$ for each infinite sequence ω passing the test $\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. By (1) we have $B_{1/2}\{\omega : \sup_{n,n' \geq m(\delta/2,\epsilon)} |f_n(\omega) - f_{n'}(\omega)| > \delta\} < \epsilon$ for all positive rational numbers δ and ϵ. Denote $W_{n,n',\delta} = \{\omega : |f_n(\omega) - f_{n'}(\omega)| > \delta\}$. This set can be represented as the union $\cup_i \Gamma_{x_i}$, where x_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, is a computable sequence of finite sequences. Define $V_i = \cup_{n,n' \geq m(1/i,2^{-i})} W_{n,n',1/i}$ for all i and $U_i = \cup_{j>i} V_j$. Then $B_{1/2}(U_i) \leq 2^{-i}$ for all i.

Note that the measure $B_{1/2}(U_i)$ can be computed with an arbitrary degree of precision. Indeed by (1), to calculate $P(U_i)$ with a given degree of precision $\epsilon > 0$ it is sufficient to calculate $B_{1/2}(\cup_{i' \geq j \geq i} \cup_{m' \geq n, n' \geq m(1/i,2^{-j})} W_{n,n',1/j})$ for some sufficiently large i' and m'. Therefore, $\mathcal{T} = \{U_i\}$ is the Schnorr test of randomness.

Assume that $\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(\omega)$ does not exist for some ω. Then an i exists such that $|f_n(\omega) - f_{n'}(\omega)| > 1/i$ for infinitely many n and n'. For any $j > i$ the numbers $n, n' \geq m(1/j, 2^{-j})$ exist such that $\omega \in W_{n,n',1/j} \subseteq V_j$. Hence, the sequence ω if rejected by the Schnorr test $\mathcal{T}$. $\triangle$

In the following theorem some sufficient condition of stability of a probability law is given in terms of total Solovay tests randomness.

Proposition 4 *For any total Solovay test of randomness $\mathcal{T}$, a computable unbounded function $\sigma(n)$ exists such that for any infinite sequence ω if $Km(\omega^n) \geq n - \sigma(n) - O(1)$ then the sequence ω passes the test $\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{x_n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$. Denote $l_s = l(x_s)$. Since $\sum\limits_{s=1}^{\infty} 2^{-l_s} < \infty$ with a uniform computable rate of convergence $m(\epsilon)$, an unbounded nondecreasing computable function $\nu(n)$ exists such that $\sum\limits_{s=1}^{\infty} 2^{-l_s+\nu(l_s)} < \infty$. We can define $\nu(n) = i$, where i is such that $m(2^{-2i}) \leq n < m(2^{-2(i+1)})$. Then

$$\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} 2^{-l_s+\nu(l_s)} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^i \sum_{m(2^{-2i}) \leq l_s < m(2^{-2(i+1)})} 2^{-l_s} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \leq 1.$$

By the generalized Kraft inequality (see Li and Vitanyi [11]), we can define the corresponding prefix-free code such that $Km(x_m) \leq l(x_m) - \nu(l(x_m)) + O(1)$ Assume $x_m \subseteq \omega$ for infinitely many m. For any such m, $\omega^n = x_m$, where $n = l(x_m)$.

Let $\sigma(n)$ be a unbounded nondecreasing computable function such that $\sigma(n) = o(\nu(n))$ as $n \to \infty$. Let also, ω be an infinite binary sequence such that $Km(\omega^n) \geq n - \sigma(n) - O(1)$ for all n. For $n = l(x_m)$,

$$\sigma(n) \geq n - Km(\omega^n) \geq n - l(x_m) + \nu(l(x_m)) - O(1) \geq \nu(n) - O(1)$$

for infinitely many n. On the other hand, $\sigma(n) = o(\nu(n))$ as $n \to \infty$. This contradiction proves the theorem. $\triangle$

By Proposition 4 stability property holds for main probability laws like the strong law of large numbers and the law of iterated logarithm.

By computable sequence of total Solovay tests of randomness we mean a computable double indexed sequence of finite binary strings $\mathcal{T}_k = \{x_{k,n} : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, such that the series $\sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-l(x_{k,n})}$ converges with a uniformly by k computable rate of convergence. This means that there exists a computable function $m(\delta, k)$ such that $\sum\limits_{i=m(\delta,k)}^{\infty} 2^{-l(x_{k,i})} \leq \delta$ for each k and

rational δ. [5]

In applications, often convenient to use computable sequences of tests. Easy to modify Proposition 4 for computable sequences of tests.

Proposition 5 *For any computable sequence of Solovay total tests of randomness $\mathcal{T}_k$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, a computable unbounded function $\sigma(n)$ exists such that for any infinite sequence ω if $Km(\omega^n) \geq n - \sigma(n) - O(1)$ then the sequence ω passes all tests $\mathcal{T}_k$.*

The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 4.

Let us show that the strong law of large numbers corresponds to the computable sequence of total Solovay randomness tests.

Hoeffding [6] inequality for uniform probability distribution

$$B_{1/2}\left\{\omega \in \Omega : \left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\omega_i - \frac{1}{2}\right| \geq \epsilon\right\} \leq 2e^{-2n\epsilon^2} \tag{2}$$

serves as a tool for constructing total Solovay tests of randomness.

Let ϵ_k be a computable sequence of positive rational numbers such that $\epsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. For any k, let $\cup_n\{x : l(x) = n \& |\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i - \frac{1}{2}| \geq \epsilon_k\} = \{x_{k,m} : m = 1, 2, \ldots\}\}$.

This is the total Solovay tests of randomness, since by (2) it holds $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 2^{-l(x_{k,m})} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2e^{-2n\epsilon_k^2} < \infty$ with a computable rate of convergence.

The strong law of large numbers $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\omega_i = \frac{1}{2}$ holds for an infinite sequence $\omega = \omega_1\omega_2\ldots$ if and only if it passes the test $\{x_{k,m} : m = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ for each k. By Proposition 4 an unbounded nondecreasing computable function $\sigma(n)$ exists such that if $Km(\omega^n) \geq n - \sigma(n) - O(1)$ as $n \to \infty$ then the strong law of large numbers holds for this ω.

We can find the specific form of this function $\sigma(n)$ using the proof of Proposition 4. By the inequality (2) we have the bound $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-l(x_{k,n})} <$

[5] We can combine all tests of computable sequence $\mathcal{T}_k$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, in a single total test $\mathcal{T} = \{x_{k,n} : k = 1, 2, \ldots, n = m(2^{-k}, k), m(2^{-k}, k) + 1, \ldots\}$ such that if any ω passes the test $\mathcal{T}$ then it passes the test $\mathcal{T}_k$ for each k. $\mathcal{T}$ is the test, since $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sum_{n=m(2^{-k},k)}^{\infty} 2^{-l(x_{k,n})} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-k} \leq 1$.

$\sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} 2e^{-2n\epsilon_k^2} < \infty$ for the corresponding total Solovay test of randomness $\mathcal{T}_k = \{x_{k,n}\}$. Also, $\sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} 2e^{-2n\epsilon_k^2+\nu(n)} < \infty$ for any function $\nu(n)$ such that $\nu(n) = o(n)$ as $n \to \infty$. The rest part of the proof coincides with the proof of Proposition 4. Hence, any function $\sigma(n) = o(n)$ can serve as a degree of stability for the strong law of large numbers.

An analogous construction can be developed for the law of iterated logarithm:

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\left|\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i - \frac{n}{2}\right|}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}n \ln\ln n}} = 1. \tag{3}$$

We consider here only the inequality $\leq$ in (3). [6] This inequality violates if and only if a rational number $\delta > 1$ exists such that $S_n - \frac{n}{2} > \delta\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}n \ln\ln n}$ for infinitely many n, where $S_n = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i$.

For any rational number δ such that $\delta > 1$ and for $m_n = \lceil \delta^n \rceil$, let [7]

$$U_{\delta,n} = \{\omega \in \Omega : \exists k(m_n \leq k \leq m_{n+1} \& S_k - k/2 > \delta\sqrt{(1/2)m_n \ln\ln m_n}\}.$$

Using the inequality $B_{1/2}\{\max\limits_{1\leq k\leq m} S_k > a\} \leq 2B_{1/2}\{S_m > a\}$, we obtain

$$B_{1/2}(U_{\delta,n}) \leq 2B_{1/2}(\{\omega \in \Omega : S_{m_{n+1}} - m_{n+1}/2 > \delta\sqrt{(1/2)m_n \ln\ln m_n}\}) \leq$$
$$\leq ce^{-\delta \ln\ln m_n} \approx \frac{1}{n^\delta}, \tag{4}$$

where $c > 0$. We have used in (4) the Hoeffding inequality.

We can effectively construct a prefix-free set $\tilde{U}_{\delta,n}$ of finite sequences such that for each $\omega \in U_{\delta,n}$ an m exists such that $\omega^m \in \tilde{U}_{\delta,n}$.

A sequence $\cup_n \tilde{U}_{\delta,n} = \{x_{\delta,k} : k = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ is a total Solovay test of randomness, since the series $\sum\limits_n 2^{-l(x_{\delta,n})} = \sum\limits_n B_{1/2}(U_{\delta,n}) \leq \sum\limits_n \frac{1}{n^\delta}$ converges (with a computable rate of convergence) for any $\delta > 1$.

[6] The converse inequality is studied in Vovk [18].

[7] For any real number r, $\lceil r \rceil$ denotes the least positive integer number m such that $m \geq r$.

By definition the law of iterated logarithm (3) holds for $\omega = \omega_1\omega_2\ldots$ if and only if it passes the test $\{x_{\delta,k} : k = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ for each $\delta > 1$.

By Proposition 4 an unbounded nondecreasing computable function $\sigma(m)$ exists such that the inequality $\leq$ in (3) holds for any ω satisfying $Km(\omega^m) \geq m - \sigma(m) - O(1)$ as $m \to \infty$.

We can also find a specific form of the degree of stability for the law of iterated logarithm. Let $\alpha(m)$ be a unbounded nondecreasing computable function such that $\alpha(m) = o(\ln\ln m)$ as $m \to \infty$. Then the series $\sum\limits_n e^{-\delta \ln\ln m_n + \alpha(m_n)} \approx \sum\limits_n \frac{o(\ln n)}{n^\delta}$ converges for any $\delta > 1$. The proof of Proposition 4 shows that any computable unbounded function $\sigma(n) = o(\log\log n)$ can serve as a measure of stability of the law of iterated logarithm.

3.2 Stability of the Birkhoff's theorem in ergodic case

Recall some basic notions of ergodic theory. An arbitrary measurable mapping of the a probability space into itself is called a transformation. A transformation $T : \Omega \to \Omega$ preserves a measure P on Ω if $P(T^{-1}(A)) = T(A)$ for all measurable subsets A of the space. A subset A is called invariant with respect to T if $T^{-1}A = A$ up to a set of measure 0. A transformation T is called ergodic if each invariant with respect to T subset A has measure 0 or 1.

A transformation T of the set Ω is computable if a computable representation $\hat{\psi}$ exists such that (i)-(iii) hold and $T(\omega) = \sup\{y : x \subseteq \omega \& (x, y) \in \hat{\psi})\}$ for all infinite $\omega \in \Omega$.

Denote $T^0\omega = \omega$, $T^{i+1}\omega = T(T^i\omega)$. Any point $\omega \in \Omega$ generates an infinite trajectory $\omega, T\omega, T^2\omega, \ldots$.

Using Bishop's [1] analysis, V'yugin [19], [21] presented an algorithmic version of the Birkhoff's pointwise ergodic theorem:

Let T be a computable measure preserving transformation and f be a computable real-valued bounded function defined on the set of binary sequences. Then for any infinite binary sequence ω the following implication is valid:

$$Km(\omega^n) \geq n - O(1) \Longrightarrow \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(T^i\omega) = \hat{f}(\omega) \tag{5}$$

for some $\hat{f}(\omega)$ $(= E(f)$ for ergodic $T)$.

Later this result was extended for non-computable f and generalized for more general metric spaces. For further development see Nandakumar [12],

Galatolo et al. [9], and Gacs et al. [3].

Let $f \in L^1$ be computable and $\sup_\omega |f(\omega)| < \infty$, P be a computable measure and T be a computable ergodic transformation preserving the measure P. By $\|f\|$ denote the norm in L^1 (or in L^2).

Define the sequence of ergodic averages A_n^f, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, where $A_n^f(\omega) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(T^k\omega)$.

Galatolo at al. [8] show that ergodic averages $\{A_n^f\}$ effectively converges to some computable real number $c = \int f(\omega)dP$ almost surely as $n \to \infty$. Then the stability property of the ergodic theorem in case where the transformation T is ergodic is the corollary of this result and Propositions 3 and 4. We present this result for completeness of exposition.

Proposition 6 *The sequence of ergodic averages $\{A_n^f\}$ effectively converges almost surely as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof. At first we prove effective convergence in norm L^1 and thereafter we will use the maximal ergodic theorem.

We suppose without loss of generality that $\int f dP = 0$. [8] Then $\|A_n^f\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Given $\epsilon > 0$ compute an $p(\epsilon)$ such that $\|A_p^f\| < \epsilon/2$ for $p = p(\epsilon)$. Let $m = np + k$, where $0 \le k < p$. Then $A_m^f(\omega) = \frac{1}{m}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} pA_p^f(T^{pi}\omega) + kA_k^f(T^{pn}\omega)\right)$. Then $\|A_m^f\| \le \frac{1}{m}(np\|A_p^f\| + k\|A_k^f\|) \le \|A_p^f\| + \frac{1}{n}\|A_k^f\| \le \|A_p\| + \frac{1}{n}\|f\| < \epsilon/2 + \frac{1}{n}\|f\| \le \epsilon$ for all $n \ge n(\epsilon) = \max\{p(\epsilon), (2/\epsilon)\|f\|\}$.

The maximal ergodic theorem says that $B_{1/2}\{\omega : \sup_n |A_n^f(\omega)| > \delta\} \le \frac{1}{\delta}\|f\|$ for any ergodic transformation T preserving measure P. Given $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, compute an $p = p(\delta, \epsilon)$ such that $\|A_p^f\| \le \delta\epsilon/2$. By the maximal ergodic theorem for $g = A_p^f$ we have $B_{1/2}\{\omega : \sup_n |A_n^g(\omega)| > \delta/2\} \le \epsilon$.

Now, we check that A_n^g is not too far from A_n^f. Indeed,

$$A_n^g(\omega) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} g(T^k\omega) = \frac{1}{np}\sum_{k=0}^{p-1}\sum_{s=0}^{n-1} f(T^{k+s}\omega) = \frac{1}{np}\left(p\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(T^k\omega)\right) +$$
$$+\frac{1}{np}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{p-1}(p-k)f(T^k(T^n\omega))\omega) - \sum_{k=0}^{p-1}(p-k)f(T^k\omega)\right).$$

[8] Replace f on $f - \int f(\omega)dP$.

This implies that $\sup_\omega |A_n^g(\omega) - A_n^f(\omega)| \leq \frac{2}{np}\sum_{k=0}^{p-1}(p-k)\sup_\omega |f(\omega)| = \frac{p-1}{n}\sup_\omega |f(\omega)| \leq \delta/2$ for all $n \geq m(\delta,\epsilon) = 2(p(\delta,\epsilon)-1)\sup_\omega |f(\omega)|/\delta$. Hence, $B_{1/2}\{\omega : \sum_{n\geq m(\delta,\epsilon)} |A_n^f(\omega)| > \delta\} \leq \epsilon$. Proposition is proved. $\triangle$

Propositions 3, 4, and 6 imply a stable version of the ergodic theorem in case where the transformation T is ergodic.

Theorem 1 *Let f be a computable observable, T be a computable ergodic transformation preserving the uniform measure $B_{1/2}$. Then a computable unbounded nondecreasing function $\sigma(n)$ exists such that for any infinite sequence ω the condition $Km(\omega^n) \geq n - \sigma(n) - O(1)$ implies that the limit $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(T^k\omega)$ exists.*

In particular, in case where transformation T is ergodic, the ergodic theorem holds for any Schnorr random sequence. [9]

4 Instability in ergodic theory

The phenomenon of instability occurs in ergodic theory. In this section we present property of uniform instability of the ergodic theorem and absolute instability for non-ergodic transformation.

4.1 Instability results

The degree of stability $\sigma(n)$ from Theorem 1 may depend on observable f and transformation T. The following Theorem 2 shows that there is no uniform degree on stability $\sigma(n)$ for the ergodic theorem.

Phenomenon of instability of the ergodic theorem was first discovered in V'yugin [22]. Compared with "symbolic dynamics type" result from [22], this result is "measure free" – it is formulated in terms of transformations and Kolmogorov complexity.

Theorem 2 *Let $\sigma(n)$ be a nondecreasing unbounded computable function. Then there exist a computable ergodic measure preserving transformation T*

[9] This folkloric result was first published by Franklin and Towsner [4].

and an infinite sequence $\omega \in \Omega$ such that the inequality $Km(\omega^n) \geq n - \sigma(n)$ holds for all n and the limit

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(T^i\omega) \tag{6}$$

does not exist for some computable indicator function f.

In the next theorem an uniform with respect to $\sigma(n)$ result is presented. In this case, we will lose the ergodic property of transformation T.

Theorem 3 *A computable measure preserving transformation T can be constructed such that for any nondecreasing unbounded computable function $\sigma(n)$ an infinte sequence ω exists such that $Km(\omega^n) \geq n - \sigma(n)$ holds for all n and the limit (6) does not exist for some computable indicator function f.*

The construction of the transformation T is given in Section 4.3; the proof of Theorem 2 is given in Section 4.4. In Section 4.2 we consider the main technical concept – the method cutting and stacking.

4.2 Method of cutting and stacking

In this section we consider the main notions and properties of cutting and stacking method (see Shields [15, 16]).

A column is a sequence $E = (L_1, \ldots, L_h)$ of pairwise disjoint intervals of the unit interval $[0, 1]$ of equal width: $L_1, \ldots, L_h$. We refer to L_1 as to the base and to L_h as to the top of the column; $\hat{E} = \cup_{i=1}^{h} L_i$ is the support of the column, $w(E) = \lambda(L_1)$ is the width of the column, h is the height of the column, $\lambda(\hat{E}) = \lambda(\cup_{i=1}^{h} L_i)$ is the measure of the column, where λ is uniform measure in $[0, 1]$.

Any column defines a transformation T which linearly transforms L_j to L_{j+1}, namely, $T(x) = x + c$ for all $x \in L_j$, where c is the corresponding constant. This transformation T is not defined outside all intervals of the column and at all points of the top L_h interval of this column.

Denote $T^0\omega = \omega$, $T^{i+1}\omega = T(T^i\omega)$. For any $1 \leq j < h$, an arbitrary point $\omega \in L_j$ generates a finite trajectory $\omega, T\omega, \ldots, T^{h-j}\omega$.

A partition $\pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$ is compatible with a column E if for each j there exists an i such that $L_j \subseteq \pi_i$. This number i is called the name of the interval L_j, and the corresponding sequence of names of all intervals of the column is called the name of the column E.

For any point $x \in L_j$, where $1 \le j < h$, by E–name of the trajectory $x, Tx, \dots, T^{h-j}x$ we mean a sequence of names of intervals $L_j, \dots, L_h$ from the column E. The length of this sequence is $h - j + 1$.

A gadget is a finite collection of disjoint columns. The width of the gadget $w(\Upsilon)$ is the sum of the widths of its columns. A union of gadgets Υ_i with disjoint supports is the gadget $\Upsilon = \cup\Upsilon_i$ whose columns are the columns of all the Υ_i. The support of the gadget Υ is the union $\hat{\Upsilon}$ of the supports of all its columns. A transformation $T = T(\Upsilon)$ is associated with a gadget Υ if it is the union of transformations defined on all columns of Υ. With any gadget Υ the corresponding set of finite trajectories generated by points of its columns is associated. By Υ-name of a trajectory we mean its E-name, where E is that column of Υ to which this trajectory corresponds. A gadget Υ extends a column Λ if the support of Υ extends the support of Λ, the transformation $T(\Upsilon)$ extends the transformation $T(\Lambda)$ and the partition corresponding to Υ extends the partition corresponding to Λ.

Since all points of the interval L_j of the column generate identical trajectories, we refer to this trajectory as to the trajectory generated by the interval L_j.

The cutting and stacking operations that are common used will now be defined. The distribution of a gadget Υ with columns $E_1, \dots, E_n$ is a vector of probabilities

$$\left(\frac{w(E_1)}{w(\Upsilon)}, \dots, \frac{w(E_n)}{w(\Upsilon)}\right). \tag{7}$$

A gadget Υ is a copy of a gadget Λ if they have the same distributions and the corresponding columns have the same partition names.

A gadget Υ can be cut into M copies of itself $\Upsilon_m, m = 1, \dots, M$, according to a given probability vector $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_M)$ of type (7) by cutting each column $E_i = (L_{i,j} : 1 \le j \le h(E_i))$ (and its intervals) into disjoint subcolumns $E_{i,m} = (L_{i,j,m} : 1 \le j \le h(E_i))$ such that $w(E_{i,m}) = w(L_{i,j,m}) = \gamma_m w(L_{i,j})$.

The gadget $\Upsilon_m = \{E_{i,m} : 1 \le i \le L\}$ is called the copy of the gadget Υ of width γ_m. The action of the gadget transformation T is not affected by the copying operation.

Another operation is the stacking gadgets onto gadgets. At first we consider the stacking of columns onto columns and the stacking of gadgets onto columns.

Let $E_1 = (L_{1,j} : 1 \le j \le h(E_1))$ and $E_2 = (L_{2,j} : 1 \le j \le h(E_2))$ be two columns of equal width whose supports are disjoint. The new column

$E_1 * E_2 = (L_j : 1 \le j \le h(E_1) + h(E_2))$ is defined as $L_j = L_{1,j}$ for all $1 \le j \le h(E_1)$ and $L_j = L_{2,j-h(E_1)+1}$ for all $h(E_1) \le j \le h(E_1) + h(E_2)$.

Let a gadget Υ and a column E have the same width, and their supports are disjoint. A new gadget $E * \Upsilon$ is defined as follows. Cut E into subcolumns E_i according to the distribution of the gadget Υ such that $w(E_i) = w(U_i)$, where U_i is the ith column of the gadget Υ. Stack U_i on the top of E_i to get the new column $E_i * U_i$. A new gadget consists of the columns $(E_i * U_i)$.

Let Υ and Λ be two gadgets of the same width and with disjoint supports. A gadget $\Upsilon * \Lambda$ is defined as follows. Let the columns of Υ are $\{E_i\}$. Cut Λ into copies Λ_i such that $w(\Lambda_i) = w(E_i)$ for all i. After that, for each i stack the gadget Λ_i onto column E_i, ie, we consider a gadget $E_i * \Lambda_i$. The new gadget is the union of gadgets $E_i * \Lambda_i$ for all i. The number of columns of the gadget $\Upsilon * \Lambda$ is the product of the number of columns of Υ on the number of columns of Λ.

The M-fold independent cutting and stacking of a single gadget Υ is defined by cutting Υ into M copies Υ_i, $i = 1, \dots, M$, of equal width and successively independently cutting and stacking them to obtain $\Upsilon^{*(M)} = \Upsilon_1 * \dots * \Upsilon_M$. A sequence of gadgets $\{\Upsilon_m\}$ is complete if

- $\lim\limits_{m\to\infty} w(\Upsilon_m) = 0$;
- $\lim\limits_{m\to\infty} \lambda(\hat{\Upsilon}_m) = 1$;
- Υ_{m+1} extends Υ_m for all m.

Any complete sequence of gadgets $\{\Upsilon_s\}$ determines a transformation $T = T\{\Upsilon_s\}$ which is defined almost surely.

By definition T preserves the measure λ. In Shields [15] the conditions sufficient a process T to be ergodic were suggested. Let a gadget Υ is constructed by cutting and stacking from a gadget Λ. Let E be a column from Υ and D be a column from Λ. Then $\hat{E} \cap \hat{D}$ is defined as the union of subcolumns from D of width $w(E)$ which were used for construction of E.

Several examples of stationary measures constructed using cutting and stacking method are given in Shields [15, 16]. We use in Section 4.4 a construction of a sequence of gadgets defining the uniform Bernoulli distribution on trajectories generated by them. This sequence is constructed using the following scheme. Let a partition $\pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$ be given. Let also Δ be a gadget such that its columns have the same width and are compatible with the partition π. Let $\lambda(\hat{\Delta} \cap \pi_0) = \lambda(\hat{\Delta} \cap \pi_1)$. Suppose that for some M a gadget

Δ' is constructed from the gadget Δ by means of M-fold independent cutting and stacking. Then $B_{1/2}(x_1 \dots x_n) = 2^{-n}\lambda(\hat{\Delta})$ for the trajectory $x_1 \dots x_n$ of any point of the support of $\hat{\Delta}'$.

Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$. A gadget Λ is $(1-\epsilon)$-well-distributed in Υ if

$$\sum_{D \in \Lambda} \sum_{E \in \Upsilon} |\lambda(\hat{E} \cap \hat{D}) - \lambda(\hat{E})\lambda(\hat{D})| < \epsilon. \tag{8}$$

We will use the following two lemmas.

Lemma 1 *([15], Corollary 1), ([16], Theorem A.1). Let $\{\Upsilon_n\}$ be a complete sequence of gadgets and for each n the gadget $\{\Upsilon_n\}$ is $(1-\epsilon_n)$-well-distributed in $\{\Upsilon_{n+1}\}$, where $\epsilon_n \to 0$. Then $\{\Upsilon_n\}$ defines the ergodic process.*

Lemma 2 *([16], Lemma 2.2). For any $\epsilon > 0$ and any gadget Υ there is an M such that for each $m \geq M$ the gadget Υ is $(1-\epsilon)$-well-distributed in the gadget $\Upsilon^{*(m)}$ constructed from Υ by m-fold independent cutting and stacking.*

The proof is given in Shields [15].

4.3 Construction

Let $r > 0$ be a sufficiently small rational number. Define a partition $\pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$ of the unit interval $[0, 1]$, where $\pi_0 = [0, 0.5) \cup (0.5 + r, 1)$ and $\pi_1 = [0.5, 0.5 + r]$.

Let $\sigma(n)$ be a computable unbounded nondecreasing function. A computable sequence of positive integer numbers exists such that $0 < h_{-2} < h_{-1} < h_0 < h_1 < \dots$ and $\sigma(h_{i-1}) - \sigma(h_{i-2}) > i - \log r + 11$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots$.

The gadgets Δ_s, Π_s, where $s = 0, 1, \dots$, will be defined by mathematical induction on steps. The gadget Δ_0 is defined by cutting of the interval $[0.5 - r, 0.5 + r]$ on equal parts and by stacking them. Let Π_0 be a gadget defined by cutting of the intervals $[0, 0.5 - r)$ and $(0.5 + r, 1]$ in equal subintervals and stacking them. The purpose of this definition is to construct initial gadgets of width $\leq 2^{-h_0}$ with supports satisfying $\lambda(\hat{\Delta}_0) = 2r$ and $\lambda(\hat{\Pi}_0) = 1 - 2r$.

The sequence of gadgets $\{\Delta_s\}$, $s = 0, 1, \dots$, will define an approximation of the uniform Bernoulli measure concentrated on the names ot their trajectories (see Section 4.2). The sequence of gadgets $\{\Pi_s\}$, $s = 0, 1, \dots$, will define a measure with sufficiently small entropy. The gadget Π_{s-1} will be extended at each step of the construction by the half part of the gadget Δ_{s-1}.

After that, the independent cutting and stacking process will be applied to this extended gadget. This process eventually defines infinite trajectories starting from points of $[0,1]$. The sequence of gadgets $\{\Pi_s\}$, $s = 0, 1, \ldots$, will be complete and will define a transformation T. Lemmas 1 and 2 from Section 4.2 ensure the transformation T to be ergodic.

Construction. Let at step $s-1$ ($s > 0$) gadgets Δ_{s-1} and Π_{s-1} were defined. Cut of the gadget Δ_{s-1} into two copies Δ' and Δ'' of equal width (i.e. we cut of each column into two subcolumns of equal width) and join $\Pi_{s-1} \cup \Delta''$ in one gadget. Find a sufficiently large number R_s and do R_s-fold independent cutting and stacking of the gadget $\Pi_{s-1} \cup \Delta''$ and also of the gadget Δ' to obtain new gadgets Π_s of width $\leq 2^{-h_s}$ and Δ_s such that the gadget $\Pi_{s-1} \cup \Delta^{''}$ is $(1-1/s)$–well–distributed in the gadget Π_s. The needed number R_s exists by Lemma 2 (Section 4.2).

By construction, the endpoints of all subintervals of $[0,1]$ used in this construction are rational numbers, and so, the construction is algorithmically effective.

Properties of the construction. Define a transformation $T = T\{\Pi_s\}$. Since the sequence of the gadgets $\{\Pi_s\}$ is complete (i.e. $\lambda(\hat{\Pi}_s) \to 1$ and $w(\Pi_s) \to 0$ as $s \to \infty$), T is defined almost surely.

The transformation T is ergodic by Lemma 1, since the sequence of gadgets Π_s is complete. Besides, the gadget $\Pi_{s-1} \cup \Delta''$, and the gadget Π_{s-1} are $(1-1/s)$-well distributed in Π_s for any s. By construction $\lambda(\hat{\Delta}_i) = 2^{-i+1}r$ and $\lambda(\hat{\Pi}_i) = 1 - 2^{-i+1}r$ for all $i = 0, 1, \ldots$.

We need to interpret the transformation T as a transformation of infinite binary sequences. To do this, we identify real numbers from $[0,1]$ with their infinite binary representations. This correspondence in one-to-one besides the countable set of infinite sequences corresponding to dyadic rational numbers: for example, $0.0111... = 0.10000....$ [10] From the point of view of this interpretation, the Bernoulli measure $B_{1/2}$ and the uniform measure λ are identical and transformation T constructed above preserves the uniform Bernoulli measure and is defined almost surely.

4.4 Proof of Theorem 2

[10] Such sequences can be ignored, since they are not Martin-Löf random with respect to the uniform Bernoulli measure on Ω. In particular, the measure of the set of all such sequences is zero.

For technical convenience, we replace in the proof of Theorem 2 the deficiency of randomness $dm(x)$ by a notion of supermartingale (see Schiryaev [17]). A function $M : \{0,1\}^* \to \mathcal{R}$ is called supermartingale if $M(\Lambda) \leq 1$ and $M(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}(M(x0) + M(x1))$ for all x. Also, we require $M(x) \geq 0$ for all x. More general property holds: $M(x) \geq \sum\limits_{y \in B} M(xy)2^{-l(y)}$ for any prefix-free set B.

Let us prove that the deficiency of randomness is bounded by logarithm of some supermartingale: $dm(x) \leq \log M(x)$ for all x.

Let the optimal function ψ defines the monotone complexity $Km(x)$. Define $Q(x) = B_{1/2}(\cup\{\Gamma_p : x \subseteq \psi(p)\})$. It is easy to verify that $Q(\Lambda) \leq 1$ and $Q(x) \geq Q(x0) + Q(x1)$ for all x. Then the function $M(x) = 2^{l(x)}Q(x)$ is a supermartingale and $M(x) \geq 2^{-Km(x}$ for all x.

Denote $d(x) = \log M(x)$. Using the following lemma, we will construct an infinite binary sequence such that the randomness deficiency of its initial segments grows arbitrarily slowly.

Lemma 3 *For any set of binary strings A and for any string x, a string $y \in A$ exists such that $d(xy^n) \leq d(x) - \log B_{1/2}(\tilde{A}) + 1$ for all n such that $1 \leq n \leq l(y)$, where $\tilde{A} = \cup\{\Gamma_y : y \in A\}$.*

Proof. Define $A_1 = \left\{y \in A : \exists j(1 \leq j \leq l(y) \& M(xy^j) > 2M(x)/B_{1/2}(A))\right\}$. For any $y \in A_1$, denote y^p be the initial fragment of y of maximal length such that $M(xy^p) > 2M(x)/B_{1/2}(A)$. The set $\{y^p : y \in A_1\}$ is prefix free. Then we have

$$1 \geq \sum_{y \in A_1} \frac{M(xy^p)}{M(x)} 2^{-l(y^p)} \geq \frac{2}{B_{1/2}(\tilde{A})} \sum_{y \in A_1} 2^{-l(y^p)} \geq \frac{2B_{1/2}(\tilde{A}_1)}{B_{1/2}(\tilde{A})}.$$

From this we obtain $B_{1/2}(\tilde{A}_1) \leq \frac{1}{2}B_{1/2}(\tilde{A})$ and $B_{1/2}(\tilde{A} \setminus \tilde{A}_1) > \frac{1}{2}B_{1/2}(\tilde{A})$.

For any $y \in A \setminus A_1$, we have $M(xy^j) \leq 2M(x)/B_{1/2}(\tilde{A})$ for all x such that $l(x) \leq j \leq (y)$. $\triangle$

We will use the construction of Section 4.3 to show that that an infinite binary sequence ω exists such that $d(\omega^n) \leq \sigma(n)$ for all n and the limit (6) does not exist for the name $\chi(\omega)\chi(T\omega)\chi(T^2\omega)\ldots$ of its trajectory, where $\chi(\omega) = i$ if $\omega \in \pi_i$, $i = 0, 1$. More precise, we prove that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \chi(T^i\omega) \geq 1/16, \tag{9}$$

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \chi(T^i\omega) \le 2r, \tag{10}$$

where r is sufficiently small and the indicator function χ is defined above.

We will define by induction on steps s a sequence ω as the union of an increasing sequence of initial fragments

$$\omega(0) \subset \ldots \subset \omega(k) \subset \ldots \tag{11}$$

We also define an auxiliary sequence of steps $s(-1) = s(0) = 0 < s(1) < \ldots$.

Using Lemma 3, define $\omega(0)$ such that $d(\omega(0)^j) \le 2$ for all $j \le l(\omega(0))$.

Let us consider intervals of type $[a, a+2^{-n}]$ with dyadically rational endpoints, where $a = \sum_{1\le i\le n} x_i 2^{-i}$ and $x_i \in \{0,1\}$ for all i. Any such interval corresponds to the binary interval $\Gamma_x = \{\omega \in \Omega : x \subset \omega\}$ in Ω, where $x = x_1 \ldots x_n$.

Induction hypotheses. Suppose that a number $k > 0$, a binary sequence $\omega(0) \subset \ldots \subset \omega(k-1)$ of strings, and a sequence of integer numbers $s(-1) = s(0) = 0 < s(1) < \ldots < s(k-1)$ be already defined.

Suppose also, that the interval with dyadically rational endpoints corresponding to the string $\omega(k-1)$ is a subset of the support of the gadget $\Pi_{s(k-1)}$. By the construction $w(\Pi_{s(k-1)}) \le 2^{-h_{s(k-1)}}$. Then $l(\omega(k-1)) > h_{s(k-1)}$.

We also suppose that $d(\omega(k-1)) \le \sigma(h_{s(k-2)}) - 5$ if k is odd and $d(\omega(k-1)) \le \sigma(h_{s(k-2)})$ if k is even.

Consider an odd k. Denote $a = \omega(k-1)$ and let I_a be the interval with dyadically rational endpoints corresponding to a.

By the ergodic theorem the total measure of all points of I_a generating Π_s-trajectories with frequency r of visiting the element π_1 tends to $2^{-l(a)}$ as $s \to \infty$.

Let s be sufficiently large such that the total measure of all points of I_a generating Π_s-trajectories with frequency $\le 2r$ of visiting the element π_1 is at least $(1/2)2^{-l(a)}$.

Consider a subset of these points locating in the lower half of the gadget Π_s. The measure of this set is at least $(1/4)2^{-l(a)}$. By construction this set is a union of intervals $[r_1, r_2]$ from the gadget Π_{s-1}. Easy to see that any interval $[r_1, r_2]$ of real numbers contains a subinterval with dyadically rational endpoints of length at least $\frac{1}{4}(r_2 - r_1)$. Any such subinterval corresponds to a binary string b. Let C_a be a set of such strings b. The Bernoulli measure of C_a is at least $(1/16)2^{-l(a)}$.

Fix some such s and define $s(k) = s$.

By Lemma 3 an $b \in C_a$ exists such that $d(b^j) \le d(a) + 5$ for each $l(a) \le j \le l(b)$. Define $\omega(k) = b$. By induction hypothesis, $d(a) \le \sigma(h_{s(k-2)}) - 5$ and $l(a) \ge h_{s(k-1)}$. Then $d(b^j) \le \sigma(h_{s(k-2)}) < \sigma(h_{s(k-1)}) \le \sigma(l(a)) \le \sigma(j)$ for all $l(a) \le j \le l(b)$. Also, since $w(\Pi_s) \le 2^{-h_s}$, we have $l(b) \ge h_{s(k)}$. Therefore, the induction hypotheses and condition (10) are valid for the next step of induction.

Let k be even. Put $b = \omega(k-1)$ and $s(k) = s(k-1)+1$. Denote $s = s(k)$.

Let us consider an arbitrary column of the gadget Δ_{s-1}. Divide all its intervals into two equal parts: upper half and lower half. Any interval of the lower half of Δ_{s-1} generates a trajectory of length $\ge M/2$, where M is the height of the gadget Δ_{s-1}. The uniform measure of the union of such subintervals is $\frac{1}{2}\lambda(\hat{\Delta}_{s-1})$. These intervals contain a set $\mathcal{I}_b$ of subintervals with dyadical rational endpoints of measure at least $\frac{1}{8}\lambda(\hat{\Delta}_{s-1})$.

By Hoeffding inequality (2) the measure of all points of support of the gadget Δ_{s-1} whose trajectories have length $\ge M/2$ and frequency of ones $\le 1/4$ is less than $2^{-\frac{1}{16}M}\lambda(\hat{\Delta}_{s-1}) \le \frac{1}{16}\lambda(\hat{\Delta}_{s-1})$ (we consider sufficiently large k and M). Then all intervals from $\mathcal{I}_b$ generating trajectories with frequency of ones more than $1/4$ have total measure at least $\frac{1}{16}\lambda(\hat{\Delta}_{s-1})$.

Let Π_s is the gadget generated by the R_s-fold independent cutting and stacking of the gudget $\Pi_{s-1} \cup \Delta''$. By the construction

$$\gamma = \frac{\lambda(\hat{\Delta}'')}{\lambda(\hat{\Pi}_{s-1})} = \frac{\lambda(\hat{\Delta}_{s-1})}{2\lambda(\hat{\Pi}_{s-1})} = \frac{2^{-s+1}r}{1-2^{-s+2}} > \\ > 2^{-s+1}r \ge 2^{-(\sigma(h_{s-1})-\sigma(h_{s-2})+12)}. \qquad (12)$$

Consider a set of all binary strings correspondent to intervals from the lower half of Π_{s-1} such that trajectories starting from these intervals pass through an upper subcolumn of the gadget Δ'' and have frequencies of ones at least $1/4$. Notice that any copy of the gadget Δ'' has the same frequency characteristics of trajectories.

Let D_b be a set of all binary strings correspondent to these intervals. By definition trajectory of any such interval has length at most $2M$ and its name has at least $M/4$ ones. Hence, frequency of ones in the name of any such trajectory is at least $\frac{1}{8}$.

Total measure of all such intervals is at least $\frac{\gamma}{16}2^{-l(b)}$. By Lemma 3 an $c \in D_b$ exists such that $d(c^j) \le d(b)+1-\log\frac{\gamma}{32} \le d(b)+(\sigma(h_{s-1})-\sigma(h_{s-2})-12)+6 \le \sigma(h_{s-1})-6 < \sigma(h_{s(k-1)})-5$ for all j such that $l(b) \le j \le l(c)$. Here we have used induction hypothesis, the inequality $d(b) \le \sigma(h_{s(k-2)}) \le$

$\sigma(h_{s-2})$ and the inequality (12). Besides, by induction hypothesis $l(b) \geq h_{s-1}$. Therefore, $d(c^j) < \sigma(h_{s-1}) \leq \sigma(l(b)) \leq \sigma(j)$ for all j such that $l(b) \leq j \leq l(c)$. Define $\omega(k) = c$. It is easy to see that induction hypotheses are valid for this k.

An infinite sequence ω is defined by a sequence of its initial fragments (11). We have proved that $d(\omega^j) \leq \sigma(j)$ for all j.

By the construction there are infinitely many initial fragments of trajectory of the sequence ω with frequency of ones $\geq 1/16$ in their names. Also, there are infinitely many initial fragments of this trajectory with frequency of ones $\leq 2r$. Hence, the condition (9) holds. $\triangle$

The proof of Theorem 3 is more complicated. Consider a sequence of pairwise disjoint subintervals J_i of unit interval $[0,1]$ of lengths 2^{-i}, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ and a uniform computable sequence $\sigma_i(n)$ of all partial recursive functions (candidates for degree of instability). For any i, we apply the construction of Section 4.3 to the subinterval J_i and to a function $\sigma_i(n)$ in order to define a computable ergodic measure preserving transformation T_i on J_i for each i. The needed transformation is defined as union of all these transformations T_i. We omit details of this construction.

4.5 Instability of universal compression schemes

Note that an infinite sequence ω is Martion-Löf random with respect to a computable measure P if and only if $Km(\omega^n) = -\log P(\omega^n) + O(1)$ as $n \to \infty$.

Recent result of Hochman [5] implies an algorithmic version of the Shannon–McMillan–Breiman theorem for Martin-Löf random sequences: for any computable stationary ergodic measure P with entropy H, $Km(\omega^n) \geq -\log P(\omega^n) - O(1)$ as $n \to \infty$ implies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{Km(\omega^n)}{n} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{-\log P(\omega^n)}{n} = H \tag{13}$$

The construction given in Section 4.3 shows also an instability property of the relation (13) (this was first shown in [23]).

Theorem 4 *Let $\sigma(n)$ as in Theorem 2 and ϵ be a sufficiently small positive real number. A computable stationary ergodic measure P with entropy $0 < H \leq \epsilon$ and an infinite binary sequence ω exist such that*

$$Km(\omega^n) \geq -\log P(\omega^n) - \sigma(n) \tag{14}$$

for all n and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{Km(\omega^n)}{n} \geq \frac{1}{4}, \tag{15}$$

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{Km(\omega^n)}{n} \leq \epsilon. \tag{16}$$

By a prefix-free code we mean a computable sequence of one-to-one functions $\{\phi_n\}$ from $\{0,1\}^n$ to a prefix-free set of finite sequences. In this case a decoding method $\hat{\phi}_n$ also exists such that $\hat{\phi}_n(\phi_n(\alpha)) = \alpha$ for each α of length n.

A code $\{\phi_n\}$ is called *universal coding scheme* with respect to a class of stationary ergodic sources if for any computable stationary ergodic measure P (with entropy H)

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{l(\phi_n(\omega^n))}{n} = H \text{ almost surely.} \tag{17}$$

Lempel–Ziv coding scheme is an example of such universal coding scheme.

We have also an instability property for any universal coding schemes.

Theorem 5 *Let $\sigma(n)$ and ϵ be as in Theorem 2. A computable stationary ergodic measure P with entropy $0 < H \leq \epsilon$ exists such that for each universal code $\{\phi_n\}$ an infinite binary sequence ω exists such that*

$$Km(\omega^n) \geq -\log P(\omega^n) - \sigma(n)$$

for all n and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{l(\phi_n(\omega^n))}{n} \geq \frac{1}{4}, \tag{18}$$

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{l(\phi_n(\omega^n))}{n} \leq \epsilon. \tag{19}$$

The proof of these theorems is based on the construction of Section 4.3. For further details we refer reader to V'yugin [23].

References

[1] E. Bishop, Foundation of Constructive Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

[2] R. G. Downey, E.G. Griffiths, Schnorr Randomness, Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science 66 No. 1, 11 pages, 2002 $http : //www.elsevier.nl/locate/entcs/volume66.html$

[3] P. Gacs, M. Hoyrup, C. Rojas, Randomness on Computable Probability Spaces-A Dynamical Point of View, *Theory of Computing Systems*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 465–485, 2011.

[4] J.N.Y. Franklin, H. Towsner, Randomness and non-ergodic systems $http : //www.math.uconn.edu/\ franklin/papers/ft - ergodic.pdf$

[5] M. Hochman, Upcrossing inequalities for stationary sequences and applications to entropy and complexity, *Ann. Probab.* vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 2135–2149, 2009.

[6] W. Hoeffding, Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* vol. 58, no 301, pp. 13-30, 1963.

[7] M. Hoyrup, C. Rojas, Computability of probability measures and Martin-Lof randomness over metric spaces. *Information and Computation*, 207(7), pp. 830-847, 2009.

[8] S. Galatolo, M. Hoyrup and C. Rojas, Computing the speed of convergence of ergodic averages and pseudorandom points in computable dynamical systems *Computability and Complexity in Analysis (CCA 2010)* EPTCS 24, 2010, pp. 7-18, doi:10.4204/EPTCS.24.6

[9] S. Galatolo, M. Hoyrup and C. Rojas Effective symbolic dynamics, random points, statistical behavior, complexity and entropy, *Information and Computation*, vol. 208, no. 1, pp. 23–41, 2010.

[10] U. Krengel, *Ergodic Theorems*, Berlin, New York: de Cruyer, 1984.

[11] M. Li, P. Vitányi, An Introduction to Kolmogorov Complexity and Its Applications, Springer-Verlag. New York (1997).

[12] S. Nandakumar, An effective ergodic theorem and some applications, *Proceeding STOC'08* , pp. 39–44, 2008.

[13] B. Ryabko, Twice universal coding, *Probl. Inform. Transm.*, vol. 20, pp. 173–178, 1984.

[14] C.P. Schnorr, A unified approach to the definition of random sequences, *Mathematical Systems Theory*, vol. 5, pp. 246–258, 1971.

[15] P.C. Shields, Cutting and stacking: a method for constructing stationary processes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 1605–1617, 1991.

[16] P.C. Shields, Two divergence-rate counterexamples, *J. Theoret. Probability*, vol. 6, pp. 521–545, 1993.

[17] A.N. Shiryaev, Probability Berlin:Springer 1980.

[18] V.G. Vovk, The law of the iterated logarithm for random Kolmogorov, or chaotic sequences, *SIAM Theory Probab. Applic.*, vol. 32, pp. 413–425, 1987.

[19] V.V.V'yugin, Effective Convergence in Probability and an Ergodic Theorem forIndividual Random Sequences, *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 42(1), 39-50, 1998.

[20] V.V.V'yugin, On the longest head-run in an individual random sequence *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 42(3), 541-546, 1998.

[21] V.V. V'yugin, Ergodic theorems for individual random sequences, *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 207, no. 4, pp. 343–361, 1998.

[22] V.V. V'yugin. Non-robustness property of the individual ergodic theorem, *Problems of Information Transmission*, vol. 37(2), pp. 27-39, 2001.

[23] V.V. V'yugin, Problems of robustness for universal coding schemes, *Probl. Inform. Transm.*, vol. 39. no. 1, pp. 32–46, 2003.

[24] V.V. V'yugin, On Instability of the Ergodic Limit Theorems with Respect to Small Violations of Algorithmic Randomness, Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT 2011), St. Petersburg, Russia, August 2011, ISBN 978–1–4577–0594–6, pp.1614–1618.